

HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 20

Saturday, May 18, 1957

Washington 6, D. C.

News Section

What Price Budget? In the aftermath of Ike's televised "appeal to the people" this week, the following questions, and answers, were circulating in the Capital:

(1) *What was the President trying to accomplish?*

There was nothing new in the TV speech. The burden of Ike's argument, stressing the need to "wage peace" and to maintain a strong defense, was obviously aimed at scaring the people into second thoughts on economy.

(2) *What did he avoid mentioning?*

Conspicuously absent from his talk was mention of the fact that the Congressional axe falls primarily on civilian programs, not military. At the time of his address, in fact, Congress had not even considered the defense portion of the Budget.

The truth is that, for recent "peacetime" Budgets, the long-term trend is for *less* military expenditures, and *more* "civil benefits." Compared to 1954, expenditures in the current Budget for what the President calls "waging peace" are *down* \$3 billion. But expenditures for "civil benefits," interest on the debt and cost of Government are *up* by almost \$7 billion.

It is also recalled that, in recent years, Congressmen have chided the White House for not requesting sufficient appropriations for the most vital arm of American defense, the Air Force.

(3) *From whom did the President — or his speech writer — think he would get support?*

His emphasis on the large sums for veterans' and farmers' benefits made it clear that he expected these groups to rally to defense of the Budget. Also, there is no doubt that he anticipated help from other interested parties (such as the N.E.A. and P.T.A.) and professionally "liberal" opinion-shapers (such as the League of Women Voters) — to carry the Spending banner in the local communities.

(4) *What about the President's comparison of the Budget with the "national production"?*

"National production" is a cloudy concept. Economists usually refer to the "gross national product," which, because it involves considerable duplication, is not a reliable figure (for instance, it includes all Government spending). It is also measured in increasingly cheaper dollars. Although it is not clear just what the President was referring to, available figures show that Government expenses have been *rising*, not falling, relative to the gross national product. Ike's lowest Budget year was 1955 — with steady rises in the years since.

The current Budget represents an increase of 28 per cent over that for 1955. Yet the gross

LIBRARY

Printed in Two Sections

NATIONAL STATE COLLEGE
national product has risen only 12 per cent since 1955, while the population of the United States has risen just 1.8 per cent annually. Individual department increases include the following: Agriculture, 81.5 per cent; Health, Education and Welfare, 52.8 per cent; Interior, 46.5 per cent; State, 43 per cent.

(5) *Was the President's treatment of the issue of Government efficiency accurate?*

This is questionable. Ike said that "we stress economy and seek to avoid waste and duplication." He also referred to the work of the Hoover Commissions. He did not mention that, however much the Administration may be "stressing" and "seeking" economy, it is failing miserably to obtain it.

The current Budget, for instance, proposes to increase Federal employees by 31,500. (The \$1 billion in Government employees' salaries for January, 1957, marked an all-time peak.) This continues, rather than turns back, the growth of "monster" Government, which has seen government payrolls increase 500 per cent since 1900. (The National City Bank of New York calculates that, if this trend is continued, "in the year 2069 we will all be working for the Government.")

Nor did Ike refer to the fact that, if the Hoover Commissions' recommendations were put vigorously into effect, savings up to \$7.5 billion could be effected. Many legislators agree with Senator Byrd's recent estimate: "I believe there is hardly an agency of the Government that cannot reduce its administrative . . . expenditures by 5 to 10 per cent and still function effectively."

(6) *Does the President's defense of the Budget jibe with the opinions of authorities on fiscal matters?*

It doesn't. Barely a month ago, Per Jacobsson, director of the International Monetary Fund, pointed out that if "free world" stability is to be obtained, inflationary Government spending must be curtailed. In other words, cutting the Budget, not maintaining it, would most effectively "wage peace." Additionally, an influential "liberal" business organization, the Committee for Economic Development, last week got off a rousing indictment of spending by the Federal Government. CED stated that "the nation would benefit more from a tax reduction than from a number of Government programs."

(7) *Finally, what about the President's selling job — was it effective?*

Capital opinion is that it was not an impressive performance. Veterans who recall the verve and combativeness of FDR's "fireside" radio broadcasts noted the contrast that Eisenhower presented. He showed little enthusiasm for the controversial Budget

that he was defending. The effect was to convince many in Washington that the President, who has been pushed steadily to the left by the Palace Guard, does not really have his heart in the movement towards Big Government.

Presidential Advisers: Where does the President get those ideas which have shaped up his surprising Budget and have bolstered his appeals to the country to support it? Capital observers lay much stress on the man nearest to him in daily intercourse and undoubtedly with the greatest influence on the Presidential decisions — former Governor (of New Hampshire) Sherman Adams, “Assistant President.”

It is not well known but is a fact that Sherman Adams first appeared on the Washington scene — not in the garb of a flaming “liberal” — but as a lobbyist for business interests.

Most people think of Adams as entering on his career in Washington in 1944, when he was elected to the House of Representatives from New Hampshire, and when he first showed his “liberal” tendencies. Actually, Adams had some years before made his mark in “reactionary” circles on Capitol Hill, as a lobbyist representing lumber interests in New England. He was then quite willing to take advice, and help in his lobbying work, from “Old Guard” members of Congress. As a matter of fact, when Adams left Congress in 1946, he returned to his work as a lumber lobbyist.

Hence, old colleagues of Adams (when he was in the House) who have kept track of the policies and attitudes of the “Assistant President,” discount heavily any real “ideology” in his make-up today. Indeed, these old colleagues claim he is quite cynical about his “modern Republican” sentiments and actually follows “liberal” policies because he thinks such policies lead to victory at the polls and continuance in power of himself and his political henchmen: “Spend and spend, and elect and elect. . . .”

Many consider these facts as constituting the most illuminating footnote to the controversial Budget.

Adams, it is further pointed out, drew to his side, or helped appoint to high positions, men of similar stamp, or those whose policies would promote the course Adams had chosen. Many of these might well be classified as New Deal Republicans — some as New Deal Democrats. It is the cause of much comment among observers in Washington that the two members of the Cabinet who seem most likely to remain (while conservative Cabinet members are slated to leave) are Secretary of Labor Mitchell and Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Marion Folsom. The former entered his Government career sponsored by New Deal Democrat Somervell, of WPA fame; in his social life he seems to have chosen most of his friends from among New Dealish Democrats. Folsom was long known, by his business associates in the camera field, as a me-too Republican and as an enthusiastic admirer of Franklin D. Roosevelt and his policies.

Another Adams protégé is the incredible Arthur Larson, chief theorizer of “modern Republicanism,” who — it now turns out — did not vote in the years 1948, 1952 and 1954. In fact, most reports suggest that previous to 1948 he voted Democratic.

Of such stuff are some of the men who have led Ike up to his present conflict with the Legislative arm of the Government. But at their head, *facile princeps*, stands Sherman Adams.

To him are attributed two major strains in the web of policy: (1) He is supposed to have a great belief, not in Ike himself (Adams, it is inferred, privately polishes no halos), but in Ike as a “personality.” He wouldn’t recognize the meaning of the term “Caesarism,” but that’s substantially what his promotion of the Eisenhower myth amounts to. (2) A sovereign contempt for Congress. He spent only one term in the House, where he did not distinguish himself. That body, indeed, is often a thwarting place, where it takes many years for a man to hoist himself to much public notice or to a chairmanship. Some think Adams’ hatred for Congress grew from this experience.

Two such ingredients as those mentioned above are sufficient — it is felt — to have brought Adams (and Ike as well) to the present crucial impasse in Government.

How to Save \$3.4 Billion: One of the favorite games, these days, among economists in the Capital is to assemble figures showing how to cut Ike’s “sky-high” Budget. The following batch of recommended cuts has been confidentially forwarded to HUMAN EVENTS from a professional consultant to the Budget Bureau itself. He excludes any cuts from the Department of Defense or otherwise dealing with national security. And he selects only 20 items of a civilian nature, in which there have been rather surprising increases over previous low Budget figures that the Eisenhower Administration had established. The table below gives, for each of 20 “civil benefits” services, the increase in the current Budget over previous “lowest expenditure” years (from 1953 to 1957):

Activity	Increase (In Millions of Dollars)
Export-Import Bank	\$ 344
“Foreign Affairs”	74
Foreign Information, etc.	83
Housing, etc.	384
Civil Defense, etc.	114
“General Aids”	523
Farm Loans	162
Farm Research, etc.	135
Forests, etc.	113
National Parks, etc.	73
Minerals	62
Public Health	331
Education	259
Labor Services	123
Research, etc.	76
School Lunches, etc.	60
Veterans’ Readjustment	211
Property Management, etc.	152
Legislative and Judicial	74
District of Columbia, etc.	50
TOTAL	\$3,403

These 20 items in the 1958 Budget represent an increase of \$3,403,000,000 over the low point in the years 1953 to 1957. Our informant assures us that if the '58 Budget requests were reduced to these low points of the past four years, this \$3.4 billion could be saved without impairing national health, welfare or security. [Incidentally, this figure does not differ much from that which Senator Bridges (R.-N.H.), ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, a month ago suggested would be the amount of the cut which Congress would make in the Budget. His guess was \$3.3 billion.]

Gettysburg (The Battle): Most commentators and editorial writers have treated as amusing the uproar following President Eisenhower's derogatory reference to General Robert E. Lee's strategy at the battle of Gettysburg. However, the staff of HUMAN EVENTS discovered this week that it was not entirely a laughing matter in the Senate. There, we found a Senator exclaiming, "How could he have made such a blundering remark?" The Senator was a Republican and had endeavored to save some funds for Ike's pet agency, the USIA, in the Senatorial battle of the Budget.

The GOP Senator was wrathful at Ike, but not half so angry at the President as were his colleagues from south of the Mason-Dixon line. The latter — according to our Republican informant — were mad "clean through," and their indignation at the President over the slight to their revered hero helped fuel their determination to cut down drastically on the appropriations for USIA. The Southern Democrats voted solidly to cut.

Checking around the cloakrooms, we found support for this explanation of the surprising reduction in the agency's appropriation. It seemed that, in particular, Senators Byrd (Va.), Russell (Ga.), and Johnston (S. C.), registered resentment. The Senator from South Carolina proclaimed on the floor of the Senate (May 15), that "Eisenhower, unlike Lee and Meade, was not on the battlefields" and was "merely a passer of orders from higher authorities." And, apparently in the same emotional vein, he put into the *Congressional Record* (May 15, page A3704) an editorial from the May 14 issue of the *Charleston News and Courier*, which, Johnston noted, "supported President Eisenhower in his race for the Presidency."

The editorial is entitled "We Know Them" and reads as follows: "If Eisenhower and Montgomery had been in command at Gettysburg, instead of Lee and Meade, both would have messaged their supreme headquarters that they could not move against such overwhelmingly superior forces, until they had more men, more guns, more swords, more horses, a USO — and a WAC driver. Don't tell us."

USIA: Economy forces reigned supreme last week as the Senate slashed \$16 million from the budget of the United States Information Agency. This was

over and above a \$38 million cut imposed by the House. Such economizing by the normally giveaway minded Senate affirms that economy is in the air.

The reduction is also a tribute to author Eugene W. Castle, who was among the first to turn the searchlight on USIA's activities. Castle's book, *Billions, Blunders and Baloney*, contained a blistering criticism of USIA laxness overseas and propagandizing at home. His recently published *The Great Giveaway* fits USIA into the total picture of foreign spending. Both books are thought to have had great influence in the current drive to curtail needless overseas spending.

Atomic Giveaway: Senate concern grows over what could turn out to be the most disastrous giveaway of all — implementation of the so-called "Atoms for Peace" plan. Currently before the Senate is the treaty which, if ratified, would put the United States into the International Atomic Energy Agency (see HUMAN EVENTS for May 4, 1957). Under the terms of this agreement, America would help supply atomic materials (which could be used for war purposes) to "needy" member nations — including the Soviet Union and its satellites. (As noted in HUMAN EVENTS previously, there is nothing in the treaty to prevent Communist China's becoming a member and a recipient of our nuclear materials.)

The United States, if it joins, is committed to contribute a vastly disproportionate amount of fissionable material. To date, we have promised to make available 100 times as much as has the Soviet Union and to match all other contributions. The material pooled in the agency would be used in atomic power reactors, supposedly providing energy for "peaceful" purposes.

It is a little known fact, however, that every such reactor designed thus far in the United States has, as the primary source of its power, a quantity of highly enriched fissionable material. This material is "weapons grade" — readily convertible into bombs and warheads.

Proponents of the plan state that the inspection terms of the treaty will prevent diversion of the materials to military uses. Critics doubt this seriously, stating that precise terms for inspection are not stipulated in the treaty. Even if diversion does not take place, however, many opponents still believe the plan is fraught with danger. For there is no assurance that Communist nations possessed of atomic power reactors will direct the energy thus provided to peaceful uses. They would more probably put such a new source of power to work in building the Communist war machine.

These and many other doubts beset the Senators considering the treaty. If they reject it, or limit it severely, it will be the first such rebuff to the Executive since 1934, when the original St. Lawrence Seaway Treaty failed of ratification.

Strategy of Labor Probe: The McClellan Committee design, according to those who watch the proceedings closely, is to force Dave Beck out of his union. The Committee—or those who shape its policy—obviously wish to do this so as to save the AFL-CIO.

For, unless Beck is forced out of the Teamsters union, the leaders of the AFL-CIO federation will have to expel that union and probably the Buildings Trades unions as well (as the latter seem to be similarly guilty of corruption). If the AFL-CIO banishes both of these groups, it would suffer a great loss in membership and money. Rumors are already afloat that John L. Lewis might pick up such “expellees” and merge them into a new labor federation.

Such an outcome can scarcely be palatable to Meany and Reuther, leaders of the AFL-CIO, or to the leaders of the Democratic party—which is intimately associated with these two figures and their organizations.

This, then, seems to be the thinking behind the strategy, judging by the persistence with which the McClellan Committee continues to pursue Beck. Actually, the exposure of corruption in the Teamsters union, which has been made in recent months, should have been sufficient to assist the Committee in making recommendations for reform legislation. The pattern of malpractices appears to be the same whether in the Teamsters or in the Building Trades. Observers remark that it seems superfluous to keep turning up and turning over week after week the same sort of material.

Besides, it is pointed out, even if reform legislation aimed at these malpractices should be passed and applied and should wipe out all forms of corruption in these unions, other evils would remain—such as use of union funds in politics or use of such funds by union leaders to defeat rump reform movements within the rank and file which seek to oust that leadership. The McClellan Committee has not yet got around to exposure and consideration of these evils.

Nor have the Senators got around to any forthright attempt to pass a law which, most authorities agree, would be the best protection of union members against the depredations of the bosses—a Federal “right-to-work” law. McClellan himself has put a rider amendment on the civil rights law, calling for a “right-to-work” measure. But that civil rights bill may fail and no serious measure for a Federal “right-to-work” law is in the works.

Tax Reform: Roswell Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury and President of the Tax Foundation, Inc., last week called for sharp reductions in the prevailing steep income tax rates. In a study entitled “Are High Surtaxes Worthwhile?” Magill offered an analysis of the steeply “progressive” rates that now prevail. “From a revenue standpoint,” he stated, “they diminish receipts instead of expanding them, they distort economic activity by influencing incentives and business motives, and they handicap economic growth.”

Recommending that the top rate be limited to 50 per cent, Magill pointed out that the direct revenue loss from such a limitation would be only \$700 million. And, he added, in practice, the loss would be even less than that, since the added incentive to earn would increase the income to be taxed at top levels. Most important, Magill noted, “the entire economy will benefit from lower top rates. Pools of new capital would become available for new enterprises.”

Aid to Poland: There is much opposition to giving aid to the Communist Government of Poland, on the ground that such aid will be of benefit to Moscow—building up our potential enemy. While that aspect is of considerable importance, others offer another case against aid to Poland. They think it should be refused for a more fundamental reason; namely, that it will be wasted.

Poland has been brought to her present economic condition because she is operating on a planned economy. Her shortages have resulted from that discouragement of enterprise and initiative which follows from regulation, control and management of the market, and from nationalization of industry. Now, if the Polish Government is still unwilling to free the Polish market, if it persists in denying the right of private property, if the economy is still the province of the bureaucracy, what good will aid from the capitalistic United States do her? For a short time, such aid will replenish her shortages, but it can do so only until the gratuity or loan is used up. After that she will fall into the same condition from which she suffers now.

So, the decisive question to put to the Gomulka Government is: Will you abandon the controlled economy which has brought you to your present low estate? If the Polish Government admits that it has no intention of abandoning the controlled economy, the request for aid should be refused. In short, the case against aid to Poland could be put in a few words: the worst thing you can do for an alcoholic is to set him up to a few drinks.

Status of Forces: American Legion National Commander Dan Daniel has moved to breathe new life into the Legion's campaign for repeal or modification of the so-called “Status of Forces” treaties.

These are the agreements, in effect with some 50 countries, whereby the United States agrees that members of its armed services, dependents and civilian components, while abroad, shall be subject to criminal jurisdiction of the courts of the countries where they are stationed.

Daniel asked all state Legion commanders to seek passage by their state legislatures of resolutions memorializing Congress to act to end these agreements. He asserted that the Legion “believes these treaties and agreements abridge the constitutional rights of servicemen.”

Actually, Congressional opponents of these “Status of Forces” agreements had about given up hope of getting anything done on them during the present Congress. One of them, however, declares that if the Legion achieves any success in its state legislature campaigns, it could well prod the Federal legislature into action. He points out that almost all state legislatures either are in session now or will be before the year's end, and says that if enough of them adopt resolutions, members of Congress are certain to pay heed.

Almost all American patriotic groups are bitterly opposed to the treaties on grounds they permit men, who have been conscripted into the armed services, to be railroaded into foreign prisons without the slightest regard for their constitutional rights as American citizens.

Letter from MRS. ROBERT A. MURRAY, President, Wisconsin Federation of Republican Women: “In these days of cloudy and slanted news reporting, I look to HUMAN EVENTS to give me the low down on what's really happening. For the news behind the news, it's tops.”

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only:
5 weeks \$1.

Yearly rate, \$10; 6 months, \$6; 3 months, \$3.

By first class mail, \$12 a year, by airmail (including APO and FPO) \$14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, \$13 a year; airmail, \$18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. Bound Annual Volume with complete Index \$15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: “When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . .”

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*

JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

tion. Doesn't a home for aged and infirm Baptists *ipso facto* discriminate against aged and infirm Episcopalians, and on religious grounds to boot? Shouldn't a pre-Warren man, so unenlightened as to leave his money to the kind of people he liked and was used to, be rebuked, posthumously if necessary, for projecting into the Century of the Common Man the low standards of a generation which lived and died without benefit of sociology?

To be sure, the Girard decision has nothing to say about trusts and endowments which are not operated by agencies of a state. Trusts administered by private trustees are presumably free to act more ethically than the Supreme Court permits an agency of the City of Philadelphia to act. Set up that way, a college can cater exclusively to Dukhobors or the Plymouth Brethren, or specify that anybody other than residents of Westchester County, New York, may matriculate. But how long will that go on? Surely the pressure groups can be relied on to point to the unfairness of permitting discrimination in a school whose funds are in the charge of the Chase Manhattan Bank when such practices are forbidden to institutions operated by a state agency!

Nor will it be long before somebody will ask the question, "What is an agency of the state?" A trust company operates under a charter granted by the state. Doesn't that make the company an "agency of the state" and therefore subject to state control over the trusts and endowments it is supposed to administer? Surely also the Great Enlightenment will eventually include the terms of bequests to families and intimates. Is it "in the public interest" that a man who insists on hiring only blond Scandinavians as chauffeurs or valets should be permitted to inherit money from a father who was too reactionary to leave his dough to an "integrated" academy of the dance? If these illustrations seem fantastic, talk to any lawyer!

One particularly depressing feature of the Girard College affair is the cowardice of politicians who, instead of explaining the importance of maintaining a decent regard for the legally expressed desires of those who make wills, succumbed to the pressure groups and went along with the false belief that the issue was race discrimination — "Jim Crow at Girard College," as the local Negro journal described it. Even the supposedly conservative Philadelphia *Inquirer* dismissed those who were urging a Supreme Court review of the case as "the forces of bias."

ACTUALLY, the issue is not "integration" or "bias" or "human rights," unless the last mentioned concept might include the human right to make a will in the expectation that it will be executed according to the testator's wishes. That was all there was to the Girard College case, as the Pennsylvania Supreme Court properly pointed out. But, when the U. S. Supreme Court got through with it, lawyers were talking to them-

selves and rich men were wondering whether it wouldn't be just as well to hand their money on to their sons and let them marry chorus girls *in seriatim*, instead of endowing a young ladies' seminary which a future Supreme Court may compel to admit young gentlemen on the ground that discrimination in favor of girls develops inferiority complexes in boys.

Since 1954, when it attempted to regulate the affairs of thousands of school districts all over the country, as the late John W. Davis put it in his brief for one of them, the Supreme Court has plunged deeper and deeper into activity which properly belongs to the legislative branch. It is all very well to favor "integration" in schools and other reformist proposals. I have no doubt that Girard College will welcome Negro boys since it is required to accept them. But when courts undertake to decide issues which ought to be decided by the people and their elected representatives, confusion and conflict are inevitable.

If it is necessary to imperil the whole institution of inheritance in order to accommodate perhaps two dozen Negro boys in a privately endowed school, why not let the state legislature do it? In such circumstances the citizens would at least have an opportunity to learn what the issue was. If they decided to go ahead with the wrecking anyway, nobody could say, as a good many people are beginning to say, that the present threat to our institutions is less from the Communists than from a Supreme Court so dedicated to sociology as to be startlingly indifferent to constitutional tradition.

Frederic Nelson has been Associate Editor of the *Saturday Evening Post*, in charge of the editorial page, since 1942. From 1929 until 1942, he was editorial writer for the *Baltimore Sun*. He won the Freedoms Foundation Award, for an editorial, in 1951. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "It Seems to Me: The Strategy of the Election Campaign," October 20, 1956.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. \$10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for \$1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "THE SUPREME COURT MARCHES ON — TO THE LEFT" at \$..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15¢ (coins, not stamps); 15 copies \$1; 35 copies \$2; 125 copies \$5; 300 copies \$10; 1,000 copies \$20. In 5,000 lots \$15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add 1/2¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies \$1; 25 copies \$2; 100 copies \$5; 500 copies \$26; 1,000 copies \$30. In 5,000 lots \$25 per thousand.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

Article Section II

THE SUPREME COURT MARCHES ON—TO THE LEFT

By FREDERIC NELSON

RIGHT WING EXTREMISTS", as ordinary middle class conservatives are known among our "liberal" political columnists, have been telling each other for years that the Supreme Court has gone over to the left wing, even if it hasn't actually become a "running dog" of the Kremlin.

Personally I hadn't taken this kind of talk very seriously—until I began adding up the Court's recent accomplishments. When you stop to recall that the Court, in the *Steve Nelson* case, virtually knocked out efforts by the states to stamp out the Communist conspiracy; that it has thrown public education in the Southern states into a stew the like of which we haven't seen since the Carpetbaggers; that it went out of its way to invalidate a New York City charter provision forbidding city employees to take the Fifth Amendment, and that, in *Pennsylvania vs. Board of City Trusts of Philadelphia*, the Court has cast doubt on the validity of hundreds of endowments, wills and trusts—well, what is an ordinary citizen to think? You can't blame the Uninformed Plebeian for thinking what the Japanese, before they got religion, used to call "dangerous thoughts."

The Girard College case, formally known as *Pennsylvania vs. Board of City Trusts*, is the Supreme Court's latest wild pitch. It involves the terms of the will of Stephen Girard, who died in 1831, leaving about \$6,000,000 for the education of "poor white orphan boys." The City of Philadelphia set up a body known as the Board of City Trusts to administer the fund, which currently amounts to nearly \$100,000,000. The assumption has been that the job of the Board of City Trusts was to administer the fund as Girard decreed in his will, just as the First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Company would be required to do if it had been given charge of the Girard bequest.

However, the Girard will has for years been under fire by Negro politicians who have made the point that the founder of the college had no right to make a will which provided for racial discrimination contrary to the terms of the Fourteenth Amendment of which Stephen Girard never heard tell. This argument got nowhere in Pennsylvania—at any rate in the state's law courts—for the Pennsylvania Supreme Court turned it down on what most people would describe as the reasonable ground that the late Mr. Girard had a right to will away his money as he chose, and that you couldn't safely go around upsetting wills simply

because they didn't suit pressure groups which turned up a hundred years after the wills were made. That seemed to settle it to the satisfaction of all except a group of ambitious politicians.

These latter did not take their own state Court's decision lying down. Apparently hoping that Chief Justice Warren was still curled up with the works of Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish Socialist, they took Girard College into the Federal Courts. It is painful to record that the Mayor of Philadelphia and the Governor of Pennsylvania, far from resisting the effort to upset a will of which they were supposed to be trustees, actually joined the movement to set it aside!

The Supreme Court unanimously—and this is a tough one for lawyers to figure—decided in favor of the politicians and decreed that Stephen Girard's stipulation of "white orphan boys" had to be disregarded for the extraordinary reason that "the board which operated Girard College is an agency of the State of Pennsylvania," and that the Board's refusal to admit Negroes was "discrimination by the State," which is forbidden by the Fourteenth Amendment. The cited authority for this last statement is—no surprise—the Court's 1954 decision in the segregation case from North Carolina. No arguments were heard; no adequate opinion written.

NOW WE KNOW that a state agency acting as a trustee may be compelled to betray its trust and violate the founder's express wishes whenever nine sociologists in black robes decide that the unenlightened founder should have founded with an eye to the views of future pressure groups. But that isn't all we have learned from *Pennsylvania vs. Board of City Trusts of Philadelphia*. I have in mind an old ladies' home established by will for "indigent female Jehovah's Witnesses" (that's the wrong sect, but why put the finger on anybody?). Also there is Tuskegee Institute, founded in 1880 by Booker T. Washington "for Negroes," not to mention Hampton Institute, founded in 1868 by the American Missionary Society "for Negroes and Indians."

So far as I know, none of these institutions is operated by a state agency, although hundreds of privately endowed colleges, universities, charitable organizations and foundations include public officials on their boards of trustees, *ex officio*; many are wholly or partially exempt from taxa-

- the freedom of his bully boy, William Paul Vinson, to assault a 150-pound, peaceful non-striker and send him to the hospital for 22 days;

- the freedom to dispatch 400 union toughs to the town of Clinton, a town with population of only 1600;

- the freedom to use political power to prevent the extradition of a unionist who was accused of an assault on a non-striker and who fled to Michigan to escape prosecution.

Indeed, Reuther speaks loudly in the name of freedom. He speaks out against big business and the dangers of monopoly. But, he carefully ignores the monopoly — and the power of that monopoly in politics — which he himself has created. For example, at the Democrat National Convention in 1956, there were over 200 delegates who were not just rank and file union members, but who were actually leaders in the labor movement.

Now, I don't decry union members or union officials being delegates to National Conventions. In fact, the Republican Convention had over 60, who were rank and file members of the union movement. But when Reuther can dispatch over 200 delegates to a convention, I suggest that that is the breeding of power of the worst kind.

Walter Reuther would defend his freedom to instruct every paid employee of the U.A.W. in Michigan to get out and work for the Democrats—and to recruit hundreds of additional workers and pay them with union funds. A force of 1580 men worked for an undisclosed number of days at a salary of \$20 per day, plus \$5 expenses — which, by my calculations, totals \$37,000 a day. These men were employed to impose and enforce Reuther's political will upon the free voters of Wayne County, Michigan.

Some may doubt the far-reaching effects of such concentrated political power. If so, let me quote a short sentence or two from the report of the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor for the year 1953. This statement was made in connection with the recommitment to the Committee of a bill which would have amended the Taft-Hartley Act in certain respects. Among those amendments was one that I had proposed which would give the states more power in settling labor disputes. Here is the long, strong arm of the union leaders reaching into the Senate of the United States:

We, therefore, permitted the debate to continue for a couple days and then Senators "X" and "Y" presented Fair Labor Practice amendments. This, of course, put the Southerners on the spot because they were obliged to oppose this and it also did the same for the Republicans who, as a party, are supposed to favor the proposal. The A. F. of L. was opposed to an FEPC proposal being added to a labor bill. We then made arrangements with Senator "Z" to offer the motion to recommit before any amendments were voted on, and as all factions were fearful and more or less confused, they voted to recommit the bill, 50-42.

REUTHER BELIEVES that it is perfectly all right for labor to flex its political muscles in the Senate of the United States; but he thinks, at the same time, that it is wrong for businessmen or professional men to do the same thing. I regret that *any* group in America, whether it be labor or business, has the political power to go to the floor of the Senate and disturb the normal operations of that body.

I suggest that Walter Reuther's present program of exploiting the labor union movement to create a machine for personal political power is an affront to freedom and a challenge to every citizen in our nation.

Now is the time for the working men of America to rise up against this cynical perversion of the union movement by certain labor leaders.

Now is the time for the working men and women of America to reaffirm their faith in the freedom and integrity and importance of the individual.

Now is the time for every citizen of this free Republic to renounce and condemn those who seek to fashion machines of absolute power.

Now is this time to reject and renounce that collectivist philosophy which regards man as too weak or too stupid to care for himself — and proposes that man can only meet his destiny through the machinery of an all-powerful organization.

I suggest to Walter Reuther that he seriously and carefully ponder the position in which he finds himself. He can be a leader of labor and obtain for labor, through collective bargaining, those things to which it is entitled — or he can become the leader of a political movement.

I suggest that he cannot be both at the same time, because if he tries to do this he most certainly will destroy the very house for which he speaks in such passionate terms — the house of labor.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. \$10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for \$1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "REUTHER VS. THE WORKING-MAN'S FREEDOM" at \$..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15¢ (coins, not stamps); 15 copies \$1; 35 copies \$2; 125 copies \$5; 300 copies \$10; 1,000 copies \$20. In 5,000 lots \$15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add 1/2¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies \$1; 25 copies \$2; 100 copies \$5; 500 copies \$26; 1,000 copies \$30. In 5,000 lots \$25 per thousand.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

Article Section I

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
STATE COLLEGE
FALLS, WISCONSIN

REUTHER vs. THE WORKINGMAN'S FREEDOM

By SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER

Republican of Arizona

IF ORGANIZED LABOR is to survive, it must resolve the following crucial dilemma:

(1) The objective of labor organizations, as recognized in the Clayton Act of 1914, and in numerous pieces of legislation since that time, is collective bargaining and the attainment of better hours and wages for the working men and women of America. With those purposes, no American can find fault. Rather, all should encourage their advancement.

(2) On the other hand, certain leaders of labor bring to the bargaining table, not only the strength of their arguments, to which they are entitled, but the power of politics as well. That is the other horn of the dilemma.

For example, Walter Reuther constantly cries out against big business and against the "monopoly" of big business. He decries any effort other than his own to find political favor through pressure upon the political parties of America. Yet, through the use of his almost limitless millions of dollars, and his likewise almost limitless manpower, he has practically dominated one political party, and, in my opinion, has ceased to be a leader of labor. He has become, instead, a leader of politics.

In the Senate of the United States, the McClellan Committee, of which I happen to be a member, is currently investigating alleged tie ups between the leaders of organized labor and racketeers and vice. With great piety Reuther has called for a cleanup inside labor. He has, by implication, condemned those leaders who have used union funds for their personal benefit.

May I emphasize that it was the *misuse of union funds* which produced these wails of anguish from Reuther? And may I suggest that the freedom of the individual and the safety of the individual are far more valuable than all the monies in all the union treasuries in all the world?

In the single instance of the strike against Kohler in Wisconsin, Reuther and the U.A.W. have done more damage and violence to freedom than was accomplished by all the peculiar financial transactions of Teamster President Dave Beck.

The strike against Kohler has been given only passing attention by the "liberal" press of our nation. It is

perhaps hardly newsworthy because these same tactics of brutality and violence have been used so many times in the past. The strike has continued for three years. The union, under the direction of Reuther, and through his lieutenant, Emil Mazey, has used every method ever employed to win a strike. It has used violence, it has brought in goons to instill fear. More than 700 acts of violence and vandalism against nonstrikers, including brutal beatings, shotgun blasts into windows of homes, and dynamiting of homes have been reported since the strike began.

Is this America? — where force and violence can be used with impunity to destroy the peace, to impose the will of one man upon a community or upon a manufacturing plant?

BUT REUTHER, in his own way, also believes in freedom. He and the officials of his union are quick to stand upon their rights as American citizens whenever and wherever their brutal tactics of absolute power have been questioned or criticized.

Reuther also believes in "freedom" to spend the money collected from union members for political purposes at any level. Reuther ignores the moral error in this practice while, at the same time, speaking from every platform about the moral rightness or wrongness of issues. I ask him, "*What is morally right about spending the dues money of members of one political faith to defeat candidates of that same faith?*"

There are other "freedoms," too, which Reuther would stoutly defend:

- the freedom of Emil Mazey to castigate openly a duly elected judge of the courts of the State of Wisconsin;
- the freedom of Mazey to order a boycott on a grocery chain in order to do some injury to the judge who presided at that trial;
- the freedom of Jim McDevitt, co-chairman of the A.F.L.-C.I.O.'s "political education" committee, to appear at a banquet given in honor of four convicted union leaders in Scranton, Pennsylvania;
- the freedom to use political force to obtain the ordinances which have been enacted to penalize the sale of Kohler products in nine American communities;